## **AGP GRADING TABLE**

1. THEME/MOTIF - The Artist has effectively presented a central idea throughout the whole of the piece.

Up to 10 pts

| Weak      | Fundamental ideas have not been explored and are not present in the       | 0 – 3 pts  |
|-----------|---|------------|
|           | piece.  |            |
| Average   | Fundamental ideas are not fully explored and are not successfully carried | 4 – 7 pts  |
|           | through the piece.  |            |
| Excellent | Fundamental ideas are explored throughout the work and are conveyed by    | 8 – 10 pts |
|           | the overall visual experience.  |            |
|           |   | TOTAL      |
|           |   |            |
|           |   |            |

2. BUDGET – The Artist's budget aligns with the PAC budget; the Artist realistically assesses her costs.

Up to 10 pts

| Budget lacks required information or includes unallowable expenditures.   | 0 – 3 pts   |
|---|---|
| Budget is complete but is not cost effective and/or related to activities and   | 4 – 7 pts   |
| outcomes.   |   |
| Budget is complete and contains all required information. Budget is cost effective and linked to project activities and outcomes. | 8 – 10 pts  |
|   | TOTAL   |
|   | Budget is complete but is not cost effective and/or related to activities and outcomes.  Budget is complete and contains all required information. Budget is cost |

3. EXPERIENCE – The Artist demonstrates experience in the medium and provides proof of past work. Preference will be given to Artists that have relevant public installations.

Up to 10 pts

|           |   | - 1 1      |
|-----------|---|------------|
| Weak      | Application does not include any proof of past work or examples are vague.  | 0 – 3 pts  |
| Average   | Application includes examples of past work, but little emphasis is given on prior experience with public installations. | 4 – 7 pts  |
| Excellent | Application includes multiple examples of past work, with emphasis on relevant public installations.                    | 8 – 10 pts |
|           |   | TOTAL      |
|           |   |            |

4. ORIGINALITY – Does the theme/motif of the work resemble the Artist's own impressions? Does the Artist successfully bring a vision to fruition?

Up to 10 pts

| Does the / ii t | ist successianly string a vision to mattern.   | Op to 10 pts |
|-----------------|--|--------------|
| Weak            | Piece design is vague and not clearly linked to Artist's impression/vision.  | 0 – 3 pts    |
|                 | Design has no originality or unifying concept.   |              |
| Average         | Piece has an adequate design that is defined, but piece is somewhat unclear in its connection to Artist's vision. Concept seems somewhat derivative. | 4 – 7 pts    |
| Excellent       | Piece has a strong and innovative design that is well defined and fully explained. Clear connection to Artist's vision.                              | 8 – 10 pts   |
|                 |  | TOTAL        |

5. PUBLIC ART VALUE – How is the art relevant to the community? Does the art send a relevant message? Can the overall design be understood at a glance?

Up to 15 pts

| Weak      | Does not provide clear insight to its connection or impact on the   | 0 – 5 pts   |
|-----------|---|-------------|
|           | community. The design is difficult to understand.   |             |
| Average   | The piece's relationship to the community is described but does not seem  | 6 – 10 pts  |
|           | as relevant / significant. Design is not easily understood right away.  |             |
| Excellent | Narrative connects the piece to the community. Compelling and specific narrative information demonstrates that the piece has a relevant and significant impact with the community. Design is easily understood at a glance. | 11 – 15 pts |
|           |   | TOTAL       |

6. OVERALL AESTHETIC – Is a high level of craftsmanship exhibited? Is the imagery compelling, and does it create a tension in the viewer without being objectionable?

Up to 25 pts

| Weak      | Not visually interesting / compelling and presents little to no opportunity for conversation.                                   | 0 – 8 pts   |
|-----------|---|-------------|
| Average   | Average level of quality of design/materials. Piece is visually appealing but provides little content for discussion.           | 9 – 16 pts  |
| Excellent | High level of quality of design and work. Piece is visually appealing and provides opportunity for conversation and discussion. | 17 – 25 pts |
|           |   | TOTAL       |
|           |   |             |

7. LONGEVITY OF PIECE –Does the piece seem like it will uphold several years of Wisconsin weather? Are the components of the piece durable?
Up to 10 pts

| Weak      | Craftsmanship is of a low quality and longevity of piece may be a concern.    | 0 – 3 pts  |
|-----------|---|------------|
|           | Materials are of a low quality/not durable.                                   |            |
| Average   | Average level of craftsmanship. Some concern on longevity of piece.           | 4 – 7 pts  |
| Excellent | Piece is well crafted and utilizes quality materials. Little to no concern on | 8 – 10 pts |
|           | longevity of piece.   |            |
|           |   | TOTAL      |
|           |   |            |
|           |   |            |

8. SITE APPROPRIATENESS – Is the site suited well for this piece? Does the piece add to the suggested site or would it be better suited in a different location?

Up to 10 pts

| Weak      | Piece does not fit the suggested site. The piece is too large/too small/ the subject matter is not appropriate for the location. | 0 – 3 pts  |
|-----------|--|------------|
| Average   | Piece will occupy the suggested space fairly well. The subject matter is somewhat applicable to the suggested site.              | 4 – 7 pts  |
| Excellent | Piece will occupy the suggested space well. The subject matter is fitting for the suggested site.                                | 8 – 10 pts |
|           |  | TOTAL      |